

Applicants point out that the Craport reference shows a sequential method in which, as shown in Fig. 3, the system tests one quantity (e.g. street address), makes a decision as to whether it is correct (step 306) then bypasses the remaining tests or, if the first quantity is not correct, proceeds to the next test (e.g. step 312). In other words, the method of Craport is a step by step testing of the various candidates.

In contrast, the present claims require that the decision of a location is made by processing at least two candidates in the same step.

Applicants maintain that the method defined by claim 1 is patentably different from the method shown in Craport.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants have made the trivial change that the input is not the street address or the latitude/longitude, since that was not the invention. These two location indicators are the end result of the inventive process. If the user (or the system) knows the street address (or latitude/longitude), there is no need for the invention. The Examiner's

attention is called to paragraph 12, lines 8 - 10, which lists typical inputs that includes a street name but no street address.

Applicants readily agree that the use of streets, landmarks, intersections and other features as clues in finding a location is known.

Applicants maintain, however, that the claims define a method of locating a point that is different from the method of Craport '572 and/or from Hancock '502.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that there are at least two indicators and that the geoclustering step operates on both (or all) of the indicators in the same step.

Similar amendments have been applied to claim 8.

With respect to Claim 7, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion. Applicants call the Examiner's attention to Figure 3, defining Craport's method, which has no feedback step in it. There are several steps

302, 308, that have "receive" but Applicants attorney has not found any indication other than that the receiving is done from storage, and not by going back to the user and asking another question.

In contrast, Figure 3 of the present specification shows in steps 308 - 310 explicitly going back to the user to either choose between two alternatives or to input another indicator.

The rejection of claims 3 and 11 under 35 USC 103 is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the amendments.

Applicants readily agree that the use of abbreviations is known.

Applicants maintain that the art conventionally uses a list of abbreviations provided by a system operator.

Applicants point out paragraph 14 of the spec, which provides support for the new claims 19 and 20,

With respect to the second objection to the disclosure; "PvC" is defined in lines 3 - 4 of paragraph [0002]. The abbreviation "LBT" is believed to stand for "Location By Text". The inventors have been queried to confirm or clarify these two matters.

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by: 
Eric W. Petraske, Attorney
Registration No. 28,459
Tel. (203) 798-1857